Atty Dkt No. 81044342 / FMC 1632 PUS

S/N: 10/709,177

Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2006

Remarks

An editorial change has been made in the specification at page 26.

Claims 1-25 now appear in the application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 19, 20, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in

view of reference patent '709 or U.S. patent publication '125, in view of reference patent '920.

Claims 6, 8-13, 21, 23 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended by including the limitations of claim 21, which has

been indicated to be allowable. Claim 1 is allowable for the same reason claim 21 is

allowable. Further, claim 1 now includes the step of prioritizing the active request state

variables in accordance with a predetermined schedule in combination with the steps of

transitioning a state machine from an engine on state to an engine off state and transitioning

a state machine from the engine off state to the engine on state, together with the step of

selecting at least two active request state variables of higher priority than other request state

variables. This combination is neither described or suggested in the '709 patent, taken alone

or in combination with the '920 patent.

Claim 2 has been cancelled in favor of claim 1, which is allowable as now

written. In view of the cancellation of claim 2, claims 3 and 5 are made dependent on

rewritten claim 1 rather than on cancelled claim 2. These dependent claims add further

limitations defining the steps of combining two or more request states using a bitwise OR

operation and grouping the engine requests in hierarchical levels. Claim 4, which is dependent

on claim 3, adds a limitation that recites an arbitration operation.

-12-

Atty Dkt No. 81044342 / FMC 1632 PUS

S/N: 10/709,177

Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2006

Claim 6, which is indicated to be allowable, has been written in independent

form. Similarly, claims 8 and 9, which have been indicated to be allowable, have been written

in independent form.

Claim 7 has been made dependent on rewritten claim 6, rather than cancelled

claim 2, and is allowable for the same reason rewritten claim 6 is allowable. It further

includes, however, limitations regarding the digital word structure of the fundamental request

state.

Claims 10-13, which are dependent on claims 8-11, respectively, have not been

written in independent form since base claims 8 and 9 now are independent claims.

Claims 14-18 were previously cancelled. Claim 20 has been cancelled in this

paper.

Claim 19 has been written in independent form to include the subject matter of

claim 1 rather than cancelled claim 2. Claim 1, as now amended, is allowable as previously

mentioned. Claim 19 is allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable, but in addition

claim 19 recites the step of transitioning a state machine from an off state to an engine on state.

Claim 21, which is indicated to be allowable, has been rewritten in independent

form. Claim 21 also recites the step of transitioning a state machine from an engine on state

to an engine off state. In rewriting claim 21, the present tense verb "includes" in paragraph

8 of the claim has been changed to the transitive verb "including" for clarity. Similarly, the

present tense verb "identify" has been changed to the transitive verb "identifying". Also, the

symbols for the recited "engine request variables" are not used. They are not needed since the

equations in claim 9 in which the symbols appear are not in claim 21.

-13-

Atty Dkt No. 81044342 / FMC 1632 PUS

S/N: 10/709,177

Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2006

Claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, now is allowable since claim 21 has been indicated to be allowable. Claim 22 recites further, however, limitations regarding the digital word structure of the fundamental request state.

Claim 23 has been indicated to be allowable. It has not been rewritten in independent form because it is dependent on claim 21, which is written in independent form and is indicated to be allowable.

Claim 24 is now allowable since it has been amended to be dependent on claim 21, which is indicated to be allowable, rather than on claim 22 and cancelled claim 20.

Claim 25 remains as a dependent claim. It has not been written in independent form because it now is dependent on allowable claim 21, which has been written in independent form.

Applicants believe that all of the claims remaining in the application now are in allowable form. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance of claims 1, 3-13, 19 and 21-25 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MUKUNDA PREMA, et al.

Attorney for Applicants

Donald J. Harrington, Reg. No.

Date: 9 - 22 - 06

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351